

Mr R.W. Julian  
% Minnesota Scrapbook  
PO Box 150  
Secaucus Ohio 45365

Dear Mr Julian,

Your recent article in the Scrapbook of October 25, 1972 on Half Cents was of considerable interest to me.

I am sending my comments to the Scrapbook as I do not have any other address for you. It is my hope that they will forward it to you so that we may communicate directly.

You are not unfamiliar to me as John Wright of the Early American Coppers Club. Mentioned that he had discussed my book on Half Cents with you at an Indiana State Convention held in May. This is of course why I am writing you as apparently we have some of the same interests. I have spent time in the US Archives researching Half Cents and while I did not indicate the full extent of my research in my book I may have some information which may be of interest to you. I believe you have apparently seen some documents which I did not in Record Group 104.

Your article in my opinion was excellent. I particularly liked the fact that you explained that many of your conclusions were guesswork. I have tried to do this in my book but unfortunately all too often what appears in print gets to be the gospel.

Mr. Parkhurst liked your comments concerning the  
 payout by the Mint of the 1810 and 1811 Coinage.  
 This is contrary to a number of surmises which Mr.  
 Mackin in his book and is the type of information that  
 is so vital to our understanding of the Coinage in these  
 days. It might also add that information of this nature  
 should be published and not held back like a  
 jealously guarded secret which has occurred in the  
 Past.

For example I am enclosing a copy of a letter from  
 Entry #7 of Record group 104. This letter should  
 better well settle the question posed in the third paragraph  
 of your article on Page 887. It also note that you state  
 over 3 million Half cents were struck ~~to~~ bet. 1825  
 and 1835. Where did you get this? When I  
 add up the reported Coinage for the Period I get 2,105,200.

It also note in the 4th Paragraph (Same Page) that  
 you have the number on hand for December 1837 the  
 same amount I found to be for January 1837. It could  
 be that the Mint did not pay out that figure. My  
 information comes from Entry #52 (Record's <sup>relative</sup> ~~reference~~ to Copper  
 Cent Planchets 1837-1850). I would particularly refer you  
 to Page 192 which shows the disposition of 400,000  
 Half cents for the Period Aug 11, 1840 to May 5, 1845. This  
 shows very clearly that they were all sold on pattern  
 tags. I do not agree with your statement that it is  
 possible that some were melted.

10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153	154	155	156	157	158	159	160	161	162	163	164	165	166	167	168	169	170	171	172	173	174	175	176	177	178	179	180	181	182	183	184	185	186	187	188	189	190	191	192	193	194	195	196	197	198	199	200	201	202	203	204	205	206	207	208	209	210	211	212	213	214	215	216	217	218	219	220	221	222	223	224	225	226	227	228	229	230	231	232	233	234	235	236	237	238	239	240	241	242	243	244	245	246	247	248	249	250	251	252	253	254	255	256	257	258	259	260	261	262	263	264	265	266	267	268	269	270	271	272	273	274	275	276	277	278	279	280	281	282	283	284	285	286	287	288	289	290	291	292	293	294	295	296	297	298	299	300	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	311	312	313	314	315	316	317	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325	326	327	328	329	330	331	332	333	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342	343	344	345	346	347	348	349	350	351	352	353	354	355	356	357	358	359	360	361	362	363	364	365	366	367	368	369	370	371	372	373	374	375	376	377	378	379	380	381	382	383	384	385	386	387	388	389	390	391	392	393	394	395	396	397	398	399	400	401	402	403	404	405	406	407	408	409	410	411	412	413	414	415	416	417	418	419	420	421	422	423	424	425	426	427	428	429	430	431	432	433	434	435	436	437	438	439	440	441	442	443	444	445	446	447	448	449	450	451	452	453	454	455	456	457	458	459	460	461	462	463	464	465	466	467	468	469	470	471	472	473	474	475	476	477	478	479	480	481	482	483	484	485	486	487	488	489	490	491	492	493	494	495	496	497	498	499	500	501	502	503	504	505	506	507	508	509	510	511	512	513	514	515	516	517	518	519	520	521	522	523	524	525	526	527	528	529	530	531	532	533	534	535	536	537	538	539	540	541	542	543	544	545	546	547	548	549	550	551	552	553	554	555	556	557	558	559	560	561	562	563	564	565	566	567	568	569	570	571	572	573	574	575	576	577	578	579	580	581	582	583	584	585	586	587	588	589	590	591	592	593	594	595	596	597	598	599	600	601	602	603	604	605	606	607	608	609	610	611	612	613	614	615	616	617	618	619	620	621	622	623	624	625	626	627	628	629	630	631	632	633	634	635	636	637	638	639	640	641	642	643	644	645	646	647	648	649	650	651	652	653	654	655	656	657	658	659	660	661	662	663	664	665	666	667	668	669	670	671	672	673	674	675	676	677	678	679	680	681	682	683	684	685	686	687	688	689	690	691	692	693	694	695	696	697	698	699	700	701	702	703	704	705	706	707	708	709	710	711	712	713	714	715	716	717	718	719	720	721	722	723	724	725	726	727	728	729	730	731	732	733	734	735	736	737	738	739	740	741	742	743	744	745	746	747	748	749	750	751	752	753	754	755	756	757	758	759	760	761	762	763	764	765	766	767	768	769	770	771	772	773	774	775	776	777	778	779	780	781	782	783	784	785	786	787	788	789	790	791	792	793	794	795	796	797	798	799	800	801	802	803	804	805	806	807	808	809	810	811	812	813	814	815	816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000	1001	1002	1003	1004	1005	1006	1007	1008	1009	1010	1011	1012	1013	1014	1015	1016	1017	1018	1019	1020	1021	1022	1023	1024	1025	1026	1027	1028	1029	1030	1031	1032	1033	1034	1035	1036	1037	1038	1039	1040	1041	1042	1043	1044	1045	1046	1047	1048	1049	1050	1051	1052	1053	1054	1055	1056	1057	1058	1059	1060	1061	1062	1063	1064	1065	1066	1067	1068	1069	1070	1071	1072	1073	1074	1075	1076	1077	1078	1079	1080	1081	1082	1083	1084	1085	1086	1087	1088	1089	1090	1091	1092	1093	1094	1095	1096	1097	1098	1099	1100	1101	1102	1103	1104	1105	1106	1107	1108	1109	1110	1111	1112	1113	1114	1115	1116	1117	1118	1119	1120	1121	1122	1123	1124	1125	1126	1127	1128	1129	1130	1131	1132	1133	1134	1135	1136	1137	1138	1139	1140	1141	1142	1143	1144	1145	1146	1147	1148	1149	1150	1151	1152	1153	1154	1155	1156	1157	1158	1159	1160	1161	1162	1163	1164	1165	1166	1167	1168	1169	1170	1171	1172	1173	1174	1175	1176	1177	1178	1179	1180	1181	1182	1183	1184	1185	1186	1187	1188	1189	1190	1191	1192	1193	1194	1195	1196	1197	1198	1199	1200	1201	1202	1203	1204	1205	1206	1207	1208	1209	1210	1211	1212	1213	1214	1215	1216	1217	1218	1219	1220	1221	1222	1223	1224	1225	1226	1227	1228	1229	1230	1231	1232	1233	1234	1235	1236	1237	1238	1239	1240	1241	1242	1243	1244	1245	1246	1247	1248	1249	1250	1251	1252	1253	1254	1255	1256	1257	1258	1259	1260	1261	1262	1263	1264	1265	1266	1267	1268	1269	1270	1271	1272	1273	1274	1275	1276	1277	1278	1279	1280	1281	1282	1283	1284	1285	1286	1287	1288	1289	1290	1291	1292	1293	1294	1295	1296	1297	1298	1299	1300	1301	1302	1303	1304	1305	1306	1307	1308	1309	1310	1311	1312	1313	1314	1315	1316	1317	1318	1319	1320	1321	1322	1323	1324	1325	1326	1327	1328	1329	1330	1331	1332	1333	1334	1335	1336	1337	1338	1339	1340	1341	1342	1343	1344	1345	1346	1347	1348	1349	1350	1351	1352	1353	1354	1355	1356	1357	1358	1359	1360	1361	1362	1363	1364	1365	1366	1367	1368	1369	1370	1371	1372	1373	1374	1375	1376	1377	1378	1379	1380	1381	1382	1383	1384	1385	1386	1387	1388	1389	1390	1391	1392	1393	1394	1395	1396	1397	1398	1399	1400	1401	1402	1403	1404	1405	1406	1407	1408	1409	1410	1411	1412	1413	1414	1415	1416	1417	1418	1419	1420	1421	1422	1423	1424	1425	1426	1427	1428	1429	1430	1431	1432	1433	1434	1435	1436	1437	1438	1439	1440	1441	1442	1443	1444	1445	1446	1447	1448	1449	1450	1451	1452	1453	1454	1455	1456	1457	1458	1459	1460	1461	1462	1463	1464	1465	1466	1467	1468	1469	1470	1471	1472	1473	1474	1475	1476	1477	1478	1479	1480	1481	1482	1483	1484	1485	1486	1487	1488	1489	1490	1491	1492	1493	1494	1495
----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

if I could like to take issue with your statement in the first complete paragraph on page 888 that all planchets after 1796, with the exception of 1502, were not prepared at the Mint. My exceptions are the 1797 corn bracteates 3a 3k + 3c (Gilbert 1, 2 and 3 humped edge) These were apparently struck on spoiled ~~large~~ large cent planchets. I have seen a number where the large cent undertype is visible, also 1800 I have seen with an under-type. I wanted thus only seen 1 1500 and this was sent to me after it stated in my book it had never been one. Now I have. Generally you are correct and I think that you would have been satisfied by saying 1803

The 1844 Coinage is quite accurate and I found quite a lot including the cost of the planchets, On page 159 of Book C of Enty #52 R. 6. 104. Crocker Bros was paid \$449.70 on November 9, 1849 for the shipment of 25 boxes of 875 oz Troy which as I compute it is for 1499 lbs av. at 30¢ per lb av.

I could spend considerable time explaining the authorities on these purchases & values. The thing I find interesting is that the Mint used Troy scales in those late days for copper while Parades were on <sup>the</sup> ~~an~~ avoirdupois scale. The use of Troy was probably due to the fact that 84 grains is  $3\frac{1}{2}$  dwt av. As I compute it each Box of 875 oz Troy contained 5000 Half Cent planchets. The common weight to Troy & av. is the grain and most computations have to be reduced to

Grains for Computation. I did this in my book  
 Concerning the Purchase of 1076 Lbs of Talbot album + Lee  
 Tokens by the Mint in 1796. The result I got were  
 not the same as what had been previously published. I  
 think that Purchases of Copper platelets were always  
 on the basis of ADU but once they were in the mint  
 the mint used Troy since the weights were in Troy  
 as to Penny weights for platelets. This could be the  
 subject matter for a fore to fore discussion if  
 you would like to do so. It's obvious to me that  
 you do get into my area on occasion so I would  
 love to discuss Hall cents with you just let me  
 know when you might be in the area.

Sincerely

Boyd Cohan

1003 Riverside Drive  
Logansport, Indiana 46947  
November 15, 1972

Mr. Roger S. Cohen, Jr.  
4720 Montgomery Lane  
Bethesda, Maryland

Dear Mr. Cohen:

Your letter of the 6th was received here with interest. In a way, I suppose, you are responsible for the article that appeared in the October NSM. I had seen the advertising blurbs which gave me a somewhat different impression than intended. John Wright showed the work at Indianapolis and I immediately saw that I had a great deal of information at hand on this area not printed in your work. I noticed, for example, that you printed very little on the 1849-1857 period. Another point is that you did not print anywhere near what has already been published on the 1793 half Cent coinage. Both Green and myself have published detailed accounts of this first coinage. The latter may be found in the May, 1963, NSM. The trouble is with magazine articles, of course, that one must have a photographic memory to remember all of the articles published over a period of years.

As a minor aside, I might note that the title of the article as sent to NSM was "The Half Cents of 1849-1857". The other material in there was meant to be general background information with the exception of certain items, such as the 1811 coinage and distribution. Also, in general, there is no relationship between the captions with the photos and my article. The editorial staff of the NSM furnished captions and photos and I did not see them before publication. Another curious point is that slightly over one week before I received your letter I sent NSM an article covering the half Cents of 1793-1799. An acknowledgement from Mr. Bulau came in the mail with your letter! The sources of the copper for this second article are somewhat vaguely done as I intend a detailed discussion in the future covering the Cent and half Cent bullion sources prior to about 1803. I am also compiling details for a study of the 1800-1811 half Cent coinage, to include an account of distribution by quarters. For the first half of 1800, I even have a listing of the banks the copper coins were distributed to and how much for each.

In general I am interested in just about any facet of the U.S. mints, including medals. For instance I am presently finishing up a fairly detailed discussion of the 1803-1804 silver coinage. I am also interested in Russian coinage, having published several articles in this area. Here I am just finishing a catalog of the Russian gold from 1682-1925; it is meant to provide a reasonable work that will correct the numerous errors found in the so-called 'standard' works by Beverin, etc. (Hopefully mine will contain as few as possible mistakes.)

Your close reading of my last article has caught certain errors which I wish weren't there but they are. I think the December, 1837, account of coins on hand may have been misread or miscopied as it is highly unlikely that none was paid out in this year. Also I neglected to copy all the accounts of coins on hand so wasn't really sure of meltings in the 1840's. This last mistake will be corrected in future articles. The three million business I can only suppose was

a mistake for two million; I checked the original draft and it read three million here, too. The 1797 planchet business was carelessly written but in the 1793-1799 article it was done somewhat vaguer, as noted above, and will, I think, pass muster although of no special value to those interested in the series.

On the Talbot, Ilum, & Lee tokens, I published the bare facts some years ago but never calculated how many half Cents might have been struck because I did not know the weight of the tokens. I was certain, however, that the weight was in avoirdupois. Early accounts are so confusing that it is never quite certain just which system is being used. I once tried to calculate the raw copper purchased by Talbot through March, 1793, but neither system seemed to work.

After the 1840-1857 article was written I found my information on the 1840 deliveries of planchets. It was not sent in because in the past the NBS has usually not made the changes requested. I have not double-checked what you sent me on this delivery but assume it will tally as we both used the same volume. I might note that I was able to use the 1850-57 volume at the archives because, after numerous requests over a period of years, I was finally able to go to the stacks and see what they had not listed in the inventory.

I wish I could say just when I will be in Washington again but there is no way of knowing as of now. I have been there four times and each time must be surrounded against articles sold, etc. The difficulty also arises when the law of diminishing returns comes in since I have gone through so much of the material already and have perhaps 7,500 pages on microfilm. Most of the information is on tape which I have found to be the most economical way of gathering information. I am working on a possible catalog of all the mints struck by the mints between 1793 and 1795 but do not yet know if I can get the research work underwritten or not. If this works out, I may spend a month or so in Washington within the next two years.

Your work copy was received with interest. I find my reaction was somewhat rhetorical and more concerned with the "why" but still the latter does settle the question of when they were ordered. I have the London report on microfilm through 1803 and tapes of certain letters after that, but not this one. I do have, however, at least I think I do, records of all foreign shipments of planchets.

I thoroughly enjoyed your and please do not hesitate to write in the future on this subject. If I can be of help in your researches, do not hesitate here either.

Looking forward to hearing from you, I remain

Sincerely yours

*Bob*  
Robert W. Julian









1003 Riverside Drive  
Logansport, Indiana 46947  
November 27, 1972

Mr. Roger S. Cohen, Jr.  
4720 Montgomery Lane  
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Dear Roger:

Your letter of the 19th was received with considerable interest. I see now what your purpose was in writing the book and had been misled by something I read, probably in the Scrapbook. As a matter of fact I do not have a copy of your work and would like to take you up on your offer of one. It would be understood that I then help you as much as in my power on anything that you may need for your studies and publications.

The matter of the Crocker Brothers deliveries of half cent mianchets is a curious one. I noticed that the weights did not seem to match very well. The number listed as being delivered, however, is based on the number struck by the coiner and the reported number of spoiled pieces. Rather than go into a lengthy discussion in the article on the differences in weight, I chose this path. It would seem that this area needs further work, but I have no additional facts at present that would help explain the differences. As soon as I get a chance, however, I will doublecheck all of the figures in this area as there is a chance of miscopying or misprint.

I mentioned to John Olsen once something that might be of interest to you. (I tried the same idea on Walter Green and did not get very far.) The idea is to publish, preferably in the Munismatist, a detailed account of the 1793 coinage. The account would not only describe and illustrate every die variety along with rarity ratings, etc., but present all known background information on the working of the mint. The letter would include such things as letters, expense accounts, names of workers and officials and information about them, and descriptions of mint techniques. This, I suppose, is an ambitious project, but would do credit to all involved.

Shortly, I hope to begin gathering facts on the half cent coinage of 1800-1811 for an article. It will be some months before it is finished and sent in, however, as I have just finished one (on the silver coinage of 1803-1804) for the Scrapbook which has yet to be submitted. If there is anything particular in background information that would be of interest, please let me know and I will forward it.

Looking forward to hearing from you, I remain

Sincerely yours

*Bob*  
R. S. Julian





Time	Location	Distance	Remarks	Notes
10:00	Start	0		
10:15	Point A	1.2		
10:30	Point B	2.4		
10:45	Point C	3.6		
11:00	Point D	4.8		
11:15	Point E	6.0		
11:30	Point F	7.2		
11:45	Point G	8.4		
12:00	Point H	9.6		
12:15	Point I	10.8		
12:30	Point J	12.0		
12:45	Point K	13.2		
13:00	Point L	14.4		
13:15	Point M	15.6		
13:30	Point N	16.8		
13:45	Point O	18.0		
14:00	Point P	19.2		
14:15	Point Q	20.4		
14:30	Point R	21.6		
14:45	Point S	22.8		
15:00	Point T	24.0		
15:15	Point U	25.2		
15:30	Point V	26.4		
15:45	Point W	27.6		
16:00	Point X	28.8		
16:15	Point Y	30.0		
16:30	Point Z	31.2		
16:45	Point AA	32.4		
17:00	Point AB	33.6		
17:15	Point AC	34.8		
17:30	Point AD	36.0		
17:45	Point AE	37.2		
18:00	Point AF	38.4		
18:15	Point AG	39.6		
18:30	Point AH	40.8		
18:45	Point AI	42.0		
19:00	Point AJ	43.2		
19:15	Point AK	44.4		
19:30	Point AL	45.6		
19:45	Point AM	46.8		
20:00	Point AN	48.0		
20:15	Point AO	49.2		
20:30	Point AP	50.4		
20:45	Point AQ	51.6		
21:00	Point AR	52.8		
21:15	Point AS	54.0		
21:30	Point AT	55.2		
21:45	Point AU	56.4		
22:00	Point AV	57.6		
22:15	Point AW	58.8		
22:30	Point AX	60.0		
22:45	Point AY	61.2		
23:00	Point AZ	62.4		
23:15	Point BA	63.6		
23:30	Point BB	64.8		
23:45	Point BC	66.0		
24:00	Point BD	67.2		

Notes: The above data was collected during a survey of the area. The points are marked on a map and the distances are measured in miles. The survey was conducted on a clear day and the results are accurate to within 0.1 miles.

1003 Riverside Drive  
Lawansport, Indiana 46047  
December 10, 1972

Mr. David S. Cohen, Jr.  
4720 Montgomery Lane  
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Dear David:

Your book arrived on the 8th. This happens to be my birthday and could not have been a more welcome present. I must admit that the first time I saw your work I only had time to glance at it and did not get a favorable impression. Over the past two days, however, I have examined it very closely and checked many of your figures. As a result I now have considerably changed my opinion. I now see no reason why this should not become the reference on the subject.

I cannot find an NNM review so I must have misread something else. Sometimes I form opinions after reading a few lines and wind up, as in the present case, revising them later.

Since your letter of December 1 arrived, I have found time to check over the 1849-1857 material. This is on microfilm which enables me to check it over with absolute accuracy compared to some material on tape. With respect to tared material I also checked the half cents on hand business for the 1830's and 1840's and found that the December, 1837, figure was indeed that of January.

The two deliveries of 1849 were, as surmised in the article, killed at 306 per pound avoirdupois. The first consisted of 75 lbs. avoirdupois plus 303.50 troy ounces. The second was 850 lbs. avoirdupois plus 143.50 troy ozs. The two came to 22,222.00 troy ounces according to mint records. It would appear that the mint considered this shipment to contain 127,118 pieces theoretically. However, only 126,470 good coins were delivered showing that a number of the planchets weighed more than 94 grains and making the average of the planchets slightly more than the legal weight. When this happened, the treasurer of the mint recorded an underplus to make up the difference in the records. In this case the underplus was 12.56 or 512 pieces. For the shipment of 1851 there were 1,960 too many good coins (~~not~~ considering the misstruck ones), which created an overplus. The other shipments are as follows: 1833a, underplus (-) 176 pieces; 1853b, - 1150; 1855, +486; 1856a, 0; 1856b, +322; and 1857, +286.

I am not completely satisfied in my own mind that the above figures quoted for 1849 are exactly correct. The 1,525 av. lbs. account for slightly over 127,000 planchets but the 347 troy ozs. being shown separately with the two deliveries would seem to indicate that these planchets were sent along with the others out in a bag rather than a box.

As I have been working on the 1800-1811 figures as mentioned in a previous letter, I will detail below where I find differences as published in your work or that I have another interpretation for the same set of facts. There is also some material on the 1797 coinages.

1797. The 1914 lb. of copper mentioned was in sheet form and sent from England, along with cent planchets, by the Gov'r and Co.

of Copper Miners in England.

1800. The 20cwt 20lbs 12oz of half cent planchets from Boulton I make out to be 188,403 blanks and not 186,886. The planchets ran light for this delivery (an overplus) which meant that 190,552 plus misstruck pieces were actually produced from this delivery. There were 1234 misstruck ones, amounting then in all to 191,786 actual planchets in the delivery. This works out to a shade over 83 grains (average) for each blank.

1802. Green claimed (The United States Minor Coinages 1793-1916) that the second 1802 delivery actually came on September 14. The only date I could find is November 17.

1803. The first delivery of the year, probably struck in the latter part of July, consisted of 5,900 half cents made from misstruck cents as in 1802. Since you list no 1803's having large cent undertypes, would it be a fair assumption to say that these might easily have been dated 1802? Some 6,016 misstruck cents were sent to the rollers beginning on July 15. I might also note that your table of (theoretical) planchets on page 29 checks perfectly with my calculations.

1804. There were plenty of cent planchets on hand in 1803 and 1804. The cent planchets from the delivery of 1804 itself were first used in late 1805 and not finished until June, 1807. If the Sheldon work on cents had examined that series as you have done for the half cents, then there would have been no confusion in this area.

1805. The mint report for this year states that the cent press was out of order so this can be assigned as a definite reason instead of a possible as stated on page 51.

1810. My specimen of this coinage is rotated 45°.

Other half cents. Although I suppose you have heard it before and from others, I would like to suggest that you include these pieces in any future revision. I realize that these are not regular issues (and some were privately made) but they are still collected and other references what be consulted about them. If your work were to contain them, then it would easily supersede all others.

When I write the proposed 1800-1811 article I will try to detail all of the deliveries, weights, and any other information I think of value. Hopefully I will provoke research by others and perhaps even will publish some of what he knows in this area.

Looking forward to hearing from you, I remain

Sincerely yours

Bob

... Julian

N.B. - PAGE 47. YOUR GUESS ON BOULTON + NO. OF PLANCHETS IS CORRECT,  
(THERE WAS NO CONTRACT, HOWEVER.) CROCKER BROS. BEGAN IN  
1832, NOT 1812.



1/6/73

Dear Bob,

Got your letter of 12/10 and today the Scrapbook arrived with your article on 1793-1799 so I will comment. Some of it will be where I differ from you and other parts will be a further extension of your work.

I like what you wrote on 1793. Even though as you state some of it is opinion I think it's very good opinion and I can add my 2¢ worth on the improvement of the 1793 obverse.

There were two obverse dies both of which were cut by hand. The head was cut directly on the working die. Punches were used for LIBERTY, the date and apparently the circular heads forming the border. Using the die deterioration pattern it is obvious which obverse was used first. Even though I used the position of Forelock in its relationship to L-1 there is another pronounced difference in these two dies. This was first noticed by my daughter when she did the drawing for the cover of my book. She is a professional artist and her comment was. "The first obverse was done by someone who was a skilled engraver and a person who was an artist. The second obverse is obviously copied from the first one" I then asked other artists about this and they all agree. The principal difference is the lower bust line on obverse 1 is thus on obverse 2 it is thus.

Head of the grandchild bust line

Head of the grandchild bust line

the addition the facial features of obverse 1 are  
 lifelike while the facial features of obverse 2 are coarse.  
 The hair on obverse 1 is soft + delicate on obverse 2  
 there is too much hair and its coarse. Based on  
 all this I had come to the opinion that obverse  
 1 was executed by Joseph Wright and obverse 2  
 had been copied from obverse 1 by Adam Eckfeldt.  
 This is also <sup>to</sup> the statement attributed to Eckfeldt when  
 he gave someone <sup>1793</sup> a Half Cent as an example of his work.  
 I agree with you that the reverses were probably  
 done by Eckfeldt although <sup>reverse</sup> obverse C of 1793 seems  
 to be a ~~copy~~ <sup>poorly executed copy</sup> of <sup>reverses</sup> obverses A + B.

Thus I found your article very interesting and what the  
 writer alone is just an extension of your remarks.

I note an error in 1794:  $10,000 + 71,000$  does not equal  
 $81,600$ . Perhaps it's a typo.

In the third Paragraph on Page 24 you noted that  
 "Robert Scott prepared No Half Cent <sup>obverses</sup> ~~obverse~~ dated 1796 until  
 after March 21, 1796". This runs counter to both Breen  
 and myself. Breen says that the small head was done by  
 John Smith Gardner (which I believe to be an assumption by  
 Breen and not based on provable facts) I believe there were  
 no 1796 Half Cents coined until after June 30, 1796 (which  
 is an assumption on my part and not directly provable).  
 What have you got to prove your point?

I wish you would read what I wrote about  
 the 1796 Coinage. I do not agree with Breen  
 that 5090 1796 With Pole were struck and 1390 No Poles

were struck. I asked Breen how he got ~~that~~ these figures and he <sup>hottely</sup> replied that he based it on the Survival ratios of 1796 Poles to 1796 NoPoles. I don't agree. Unfortunately Breen's figures which first appeared in the NSM of December 1953 have been accepted as the Gospel. This got to have more proof that just Waller says which is no better than yours or mine. We ~~both~~ have all worked with the same basic material from the National Archives.

In the last paragraph on page 24 you make reference to the 1914 Sheet Copper being in sheet form. You also mentioned this in your last letter to me. The source you have stated to be the Governors & Co of Coppermines of England. I didn't find this source but in Entry #46 "account book for delivery of Cents and Half Cents 1796-1803" I found the following:

1796 <sup>Dec</sup> 10 — By Copper rec'd in planchets for  
Half Cents  $\frac{11}{1914}$

I'll go down and get another copy for you if you want it. Where did you get the information that it was sheet copper? And how do you know this shipment was from Governors etc?

On Page 26 you noted the difference in weight for the 1797 delivery 112,802 vs 107,048. Did you try to tie this into what I had to say on the 1797's of value the 1797's were even being struck in 1800. This is a discussion which I do not believe can be satisfactory even put to rest.

(4)

The Crimped edge ad the lettered edge as well as  
a number of plain edge pieces are struck from the  
same die (The <sup>1797</sup> Low Head) Both the lettered edge +  
crimped edges are very odd in that they are beveled.  
1 E.

|| If you have any of these take a look. I  
am inclined to believe these were done with an experimental  
Roller. I think the statement that the Coins <sup>themselves</sup> are experimental  
is incorrect and I don't agree with Taxay that they are  
Mint Patterns.

Finally your last sentence "Half Cent Caneage  
was to resume in June 1800" The account book says  
April 29, 1800 5750  
May 16 2872

Despite all the Nit picking the article was  
Very good. Perhaps if you had had my book.  
When you wrote it you would have had a ~~little~~ few  
more ideas to cause you to ponder. I know  
this is what happens to me. Now to your letter.

1800 - yea, I blew it!! Checking over my original  
arithmetic the 20ths came out at 167 planks Not 1,667  
as it should have been. thus I get:

20 Tons	186 667
20 lbs	1 667
10 oz	52
	<hr/>
	188,386

I did not have a record of the Messick ones just the same I still want to know what dates were on the deliveries of April 29 + May 16th which for a lack of any other solution I have assigned the low Head 1797's to.

As it stands now the deliveries from June 5 through Dec 31 1800 would be

190,552	Boulton platelets
12,000	Rolls down large cast?
202,552	

1802. Your mention of Breens report of a Sept 14 1802 delivery is interesting. I ran across something in the archives that I found interesting in the account book. 1796-1803 I came across a page which had the following entries

This is from the account book.

This is written in in Pencil By Walter Breen

Aug 14

(Cash delivery.)

→ SEPT 14

Delivered to the Treasurer of the Mint Half Cents  
 Coined out the former deposit forty one shillings  
 in Half Cents say 41 shillings  
 amount in Half Cents 8200

→ Sept 07

(Cash delivery.)

I know Walter Hardbaiter told me it was on August 14th entry and was mentioned in my book as such. I then got a copy made of the page

(6)

1803. I have never seen an 1803 with an undertype. Perhaps they were dated 1802 but again this is conjecture.

The rest of your comments are noted and I thank you. I really have nothing to add.

When you write the Proposed 1800-1811 article, I'll be glad to look it over, if you want me to. One thing I always keep in mind in such reviews is that this is Not Writing the article. To many reviews fall into this trap but again it's up to you.

You mentioned that perhaps Breen will publish some of what he knows. Did you put this in to provide me with a laugh? I'm going over Numismatic periodicals for the last 20 years or so. Walter Breen has stated he was working on books of just about every facet of American Numismatics. To date I've only seen a few works on U.S. Gold Coins which are not usually collected by Variety. I do know that in the 1958 Wayne Raymond Starbuck Catalogue it is stated that Breen's Book on Half Cents will be published later in that year. I've read so much about what Breen is going to do and what Breen knows that I've gotten to the point of Question anything he says or writes. This is a major reason I wrote the book on Half Cents. His attitude towards me has been very antagonistic. It's as if How dare I question God. Well I've done it.









is a distinct possibility that part of this purchase was composed of these tokens. This would then perhaps explain why you do not show any 1796 token overstrikes - the mint might have run out of blanks in March (June 30, 1796).

It is a remote possibility that the entire 1914 lbs. consisted of tokens, however. This would then have given the coin the right to say that the December 10 delivery consisted of planchets. This would in turn mean that all of the half cents struck in 1797 were from the Talbot, Allum, and Lee tokens, a hardly defensible position. The best solution is to say that the sheet copper in the December 10 business consisted, in proportion, to the number of 1797 half cents not struck over tokens. I am not certain that anyone is in a position to say what that proportion is, however. If you are interested in the purchases of copper in 1796, they will be found in the 10/65, NSM.

Perhaps I should note in passing that I have the cent book on microfilm. With the exception of part of Sullivan Ledger B, I have on microfilm every document at the archives through 1810 and, for some series, longer. There is another minor exception - an assay notebook for 1795 - but I do not really count this because that could not find it when I ordered it filmed. I wish I were in your position but such is not the case. It is easy to think of things that one has missed when he comes home from the archives, but I cannot have everything filmed, unfortunately. All of my microfilming was done at the 5¢ rate so that helped.

1800. I plead guilty to just looking at the warrants listing coins delivered. At that time I had not yet copied the 1800 material off the microfilm. The only half cent I have prior to 1804 is a very poor lettered edge of 1795, so I regret to say that I cannot lay my hands on a 1797. My trouble is that when I have finally gotten enough money to buy coins I cannot afford early American pieces. For the last several years I have had to be content with writing about the coins and not being able to own them. Most purchases have been of Russian pieces, especially of Nicholas II. I have close to 1400 pieces, dating from about 1595 to present. Most are after 1850, however.

I will be more than happy to send you copies of my typed draft on the 1800-1811 years. It will be several weeks and perhaps longer as I have several projects ahead of it, including an article on the 1804 dollar which is nearing completion and setting up the Russian gold section for the second edition of the Krause/Mishler world coin book. This weekend I am putting the finishing touches on my manuscript of the Russian gold coinage of 1582-1925, some 70 pages plus over 100 illustrations.

The comments on Green were really meant to be serious. However, I, too, have been long puzzled by the catalogs that never seem to get published. But I have seen part of his catalog on Times (the 1790's) and it was first rate. On the other hand, I did most of the mintage figures for Taxay's work on U.S. coins and my refusal to accept many of Green's figures for the early cents led to quite a row with Taxay. I know many who like him less than you do (NSM, Coin World, for example) but Krause (Coins Magazine) will publish virtually anything he writes. I suppose that the only thing to say is that I have mixed emotions.

incerely

Bob

Smaller blanket  
for 3 a h + c  
Due to over weight  
142

1914 Ltd. Tax Table. 1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

Revenue. A.D. 1914

1914 Ltd. Tax Table = 13,398,800 000

1914 Ltd. Tax Table = 90,587 1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table

1914 Ltd. Tax Table



DECEMBER





1923 Riverside Drive  
Tombstone, Indiana 46087  
February 17, 1972

2/17

Mr. Bruce L. Gibson, Esq.  
6730 Sanderson Lane  
Richards, Maryland 21151

Dear Bruce:

I had intended to answer your letter of January 29 earlier but several factors, including the birth of my uncle, has intervened to this in all of my correspondence. It would have been of little interest, perhaps, to me because the 1797 business was shut down to work out financial off two articles that I had been working on for some time. These were the one of the half cents of 1797 and the one of 1804. I had about 180 sheets of each with one of the 1804 better. While at it, the machine was checked and then turned out corrections. It is an no more finished and it is the one article I intend to submit with a little editing.

Finally I had meant to include about 1811 in this article, but the length of the draft in its continued no to stop at 1804. Another will be written covering the years of 1804 through 1811 with the same type information. I have yet to check the figures in the article enclosed, I think not.

Generally you will find the table of half cents struck and distributed of interest. The number of cents and half cents on hand certainly has a bearing in the determination of when and how many copper coins to strike. As an aside, I will look forward to see whether you might take on the draft.

On the 1797 planchets I am not so sure of anything now. In addition to the 1804 loss from either there was at least 213 lost of "striking" cents out to me. I now think that any 1797 half cents struck on this planchets must have been on earlier mintage. You men of business have hit on the regular ratio of about 1000 from 1811. As I see time I will work on this and try to make up with an overall picture.

Among these things, I am planning an article for coins to be a general history of the half cent. This will be some 4000 away of 1811 to finish the present series for 1811 first. I would like to suggest that you publish your thoughts on the 1799 overpass, number in the numismaticist. It is not enough for me to publish each information and I shall like to see it in print. On the other hand you might wish to wait for a second edition of your work.

In a few weeks I hope to be submitting for a possible grant on a catalogue of the whole struck by the mint. If successful, then perhaps I will be in the last act this season.

Looking forward to hearing from you, I remain

Sincerely yours

*Bob*  
B. Julian























1003 Riverside Drive  
Logansport, Indiana 46947  
May 7, 1973

Mr. Roger S. Cohen, Jr.  
4720 Montgomery Lane  
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Dear Roger:

I hope you enjoyed our discussion this evening over the phone as much as I did. At any rate the 1805/11 draft is enclosed. It has been heavily changed, as you can see, in order to make it more concise. The 'numbers on hand' is not with it since I will simply copy this part off some other sheets. These are as follows (I am sure that you <sup>have</sup> the numbers struck by quarters):

	$\frac{1}{2}$ c	1c		$\frac{1}{2}$ c	1c
1805	480,000	134,000	1809	456,000	114,000
	46,464	-		736,000	-
	-	162,000		770,000	-
	86,000	64,000		508,000	73,500
1806	29,000	194,000	1810	616,000	132,000
	-	-		494,000	219,000
	6,000	-		302,000	201,500
	72,000	<del>12,500</del>		131,000	214,000
1807	42,000	<del>2,500</del>	164,000	102,000	216,525
	91,000	<del>2,500</del>		-	2,525
	197,000	<del>4,000</del>		-	-
	167,000	<del>1,500</del>	12,500	-	-
1808	207,000	9,500			
	470,000	242,000			
	450,000	402,000			
	356,930	162,500			


(Sorry about the bumbling on the cents as my notes are hard to read.)

These figures are found in the Bullion Waste Books as I mentioned. The figures given, however, never show anything except how many were distributed. These might continue through the early 1830's but I am not sure just how much value would lie in these.

I might mention in passing that this will be the last article (on  $\frac{1}{2}$ cs) I will submit to NSM unless I return to the archives and get some fresh material. There will, however, be one or two submitted to Coins Magazine but this will be sometime in 1974. They will be much more general in nature.

Looking forward to hearing from you, I remain

Sincerely yours

  
R.W. Julian

P.S. I seem to be all thumbs tonight!

JULIAN

5/16/73

Dear Bob:

I tried to call you on the phone last night but the operator did not have a number for you.

Knowing of your request on the 1805-1811 article I only have a few notes. I like the article and as I said I have the outline.

on Page 3 - enclosed

on Page 9 - enclosed.

Thanks for letting me see the material before publication.

Sincerely  
Rogers

FROM:

ROGER S. COHEN, JR., P. A.  
 Certified Public Accountants  
 4701 SANGAMORE ROAD  
 BETHESDA, MARYLAND 20016  
 Phone: (301) 229-7700

TO:

Bob Tyeagan  
 1003 Riverside Dr  
 Highland IN 46747

MESSAGE

SUBJECT

DATE

7/13/82

FOLD

Dear Bob,

Since your name nowhere in the document  
 is given, and it came to mind that I wanted to send  
 your copy of it, I would like to mail it.

With your please, please the above your consent  
 releases it to the state of Ohio.

SIGNED

Roger Cohen

1003 Riverside Drive  
Logansport, IN 46947  
July 30, 1982

Mr. Roger S. Cohen, Jr.  
4701 Sangamore Road  
Bethesda, MD 20016

Dear Roger:

Your letter was received with thanks. I would appreciate very much receiving a copy of the revised work on half cents. However, it occurs to me that I failed to send you a copy of my own book (done for TAMS) on the medals struck by the U.S. Mint from 1792 to 1892. If you are going to be at the Boston ANA I will simply bring a copy with me for you. If not, I will send one. Let me know which is best.

Sincerely



R.W. Julian

*mailed 8/3/82*

9/20/64

Mr Robert W. Julian  
1003 Riverside Dr  
Logansport IND. 46947

Dear Bob,

Your article in the Sept issue of "The Numismatist" was read with great interest. Your opening statement that No Cents were coined in 1815 can now be changed to say No Cents were dated 1815 which now seems a play on words. but is the true statement. There are many parts of your article that interested me. Discussion of Press usage, obverse entries, Mint reluctance to use furnaces & rollers for Copper Centage and the role of Robert Scot in engraving the dies were very well done. I can not help but note considerable difference in your writing from Green's

Walters Half Cent book is in my opinion a great chipmunk. There are MANY errors of fact in it and the avoidance of words makes hard reading to for me. I have even noted many contradictions in the text. If you haven't gotten a copy you should as your 1973 NSM articles are quoted very liberally. I am planning to write a critique of Walters book which will probably take a year but the poor scholarship in it just can not in my opinion be allowed to pass unnoticed.

It was good to see you in Detroit and perhaps we can have a longer talk sometime when you get to the archives.

Sincerely

Rogan

N.B. Am enclosing my 20 minute talk which I plan to give at the ANS Meeting in November. Since you've mentioned it I thought you might be interested

R.

1003 Riverside Drive  
Logansport, IN 46947  
September 23, 1984

Dear Roger:

Your letter was received yesterday with thanks. The advance copy of the ANS speech was also appreciated.

The 1815 cent article was sort of duplicated for the ANS since I did one for the seminar covering the delivery of cent planchets in July 1801. I cannot be there to present it in person but did receive a letter indicating that it will be used as part of the published record for the conference. I will see if I can make a good copy to send you in advance, but it will be a few days before this can be done. The ANS article differs mainly in the fact that I went into much more detail on the shipment itself, costs, etc. Their accounting procedures for the copper coinage are curious in places but once mastered show a considerable amount of information not available in the letters.

Except for the short glance at Detroit I have not yet had a chance to go through Walter's half cent book. I might note, however, that he had written me some time back (perhaps two or three years ago) asking for copies of the earlier half cent articles I had done for NSM because his copies had become lost or stolen over the years.

I have been working for some time on the half cent and cent coinages of 1816-1836 in terms of deliveries, distribution and the like. The Numismatic News article of earlier this past summer was a stab at organizing the material into a little better form but a long ways from definitive answers. I have been having considerable amounts of filming done at the Archives but have not yet found exactly what I am searching for in terms of material. There are several obscure places to look but all of this takes time and I suspect that it will be sometime next spring before anything can be ready for publication.

While at Detroit I mentioned to Walter a fact that you may already be aware of from the NN article. The 1834 shipment of half cent blanks from Boulton was specifically ordered to have a higher milling and therefore would be slightly smaller in diameter than the shipment of 1825. Careful measurements of 1833 and 1834 half cents might show these differences and help to distinguish between the strikings and time of manufacture.

My chances of being at the Archives in the foreseeable future are not very good, unfortunately.

Sincerely

Bob

THE  
DIE  
MAKING  
RECORDS

THE BOULTON CENT PLANCHET DELIVERY OF JULY 1801

by R.W. Julian

When the Philadelphia Mint began cent coinage in February 1793 there were difficulties in assuring a steady supply of copper. From late in 1792 Mint Director David Rittenhouse had decided that the best way of accomplishing this was to import sheet copper of the proper thickness from abroad. Merchants were used as middlemen so that the risk would not fall on the government.

Throughout the rest of 1793 and 1794 this policy of importing sheet copper was continued; the copper was normally of the proper guage so that cent planchets could be cut out directly without having to roll the copper. Once the planchets had been produced, however, clippings remained, which were in turn melted and then rolled out to the proper thickness. Blanks were now punched out from this new sheet copper.

The above process was part of an endless chain with some of the copper being melted over and over again plus a constant infusion of new clippings. Flaws in the arrangement included an irregular supply of sheet copper and the constant wear on the fragile rollers which tended towards frequent breakdowns. Half cent coinage depended upon Mint-rolled copper since the imported sheet was usually of cent thickness only.

In December 1794 the last delivery of coined cents was made for the year and Mint workmen then abandoned copper coinage for the next several months. The rationale was that the heavy silver coinage of early 1795 did not allow for the coinage of copper; the gold strikings which began in July 1795 gave added reason for not resuming the copper coinage.

*No Demand?*

Towards the latter part of 1795 there were two small copper coinages in which scrap copper on hand was melted and rolled down for cent and half cent blanks. This was so hard on the rollers, however, that very little was done at that time.

The second of these small coinages came under the auspices of Mint Director Elias Boudinot, in office since late October 1795. The new director, an energetic and intelligent officer, was determined to solve the Mint's copper supply problem. It was to be a long and difficult process.

In the early part of 1796 Boudinot wrote Matthew Boulton, the well-known English private coiner and manufacturer, in an effort to find a steady supply of well-made sheet copper. Boulton, whose factory was at Soho, near Birmingham, replied that he was unable to send any copper for the time being - due to other and pressing commitments - but did suggest that the Philadelphia Mint have planchets manufactured for it rather than sheet copper.

Meanwhile the Mint resumed coinage of cents and half cents at the end of 1795 and continued at a strong pace well into the new year using the same system for copper supplies that was in effect for 1793 and 1794. By the spring of 1796 the rollers were in such poor condition that Boudinot was forced to restrict their use by the coiner to gold and silver ingots. The clippings remaining after punching out the blanks were now sold as scrap to local coppersmiths.

To obtain a steady supply of copper Boudinot now turned to William Coltman of the Governor & Company of Copper Miners in England, an English firm with an agent in Philadelphia. Coltman agreed to ship sheet copper - plus a small proportion of the order in ready-made cent planchets - and did so, the shipment arriving in Philadelphia during the month of October 1796. The director was not



at all pleased with the results of this order.

The Coltman sheet copper was very poorly manufactured and had to be re-rolled before it could be used while the planchets sent were of an inferior quality which required cleaning in many cases before they could be struck. Nevertheless, it was the only copper on hand and the Coltman shipment was used for coinage in late 1796 and early 1797. The scrap copper was again mostly sold, though some of it was used as alloy for the precious metal coinage.

In early 1797 Boudinot again tried to make a business arrangement with Matthew Boulton and this time partially succeeded. The negotiations were aided by Samuel Bayard, a relative of Boudinot's and the American Claims Commissioner in England. Bayard pressed Boulton for a shipment of cent planchets and at last was successful though only four tons, less than 400,000 blanks, were agreed to at first. Because of the small amount obtained from Boulton, Bayard later contracted with Governor & Company for an additional four tons of planchets; the latter cost £11 more per ton than those of Boulton, but there was an urgent need for blanks, regardless of source.

Delivery of both English shipments came in the latter part of 1797 and the director was able to compare their quality. That of Governor & Company was just as poor as in 1796 while Boulton's was ideal for the coining press. Boudinot wrote Coltman a stinging letter about the imperfections of his planchets and from this point in time, until after the War of 1812, the Boulton firm was to supply all the ready-made copper cent and half cent blanks used for United States coinage.

From 1798 to 1800 there was a reasonably steady supply of copper cent planchets - as well as one delivery of half cent blanks - though there were occasional periods when the Mint was out of Boulton

copper; in late September 1800, however, the supply of cent blanks became exhausted. The coiner then turned to the half cent planchets on hand but these too were all turned into coin by the end of the year. As of mid-December 1800 the Mint was out of planchets entirely.

Boulton obtained his copper from Wales with it first being smelted near the mines before being shipped by canal to Birmingham but the winter of 1800-1801 had been a severe one and the canals had frozen for an extended period, delaying regular barge traffic. On top of this, however, the English coiner was short of ready funds to purchase the raw copper since he had nearly £10,000 sterling tied up in Norway and Denmark and feared its loss due to the war then raging in Europe.

Director Boudinot grew increasingly impatient at the delay since workmen were idle and there was no copper coinage to distribute. He wrote several times during the winter asking Boulton to ship the copper planchets as soon as was possible. On January 31, 1801, Boulton wrote that he hoped to ship 20 or 30 tons of them in the spring, indicating that copper had fallen a bit in price; this letter was received in Philadelphia towards the end of April.

By early in May, therefore, the director was convinced that Boulton would ship planchets shortly or would not do so at all. On May 11 a bill of exchange for £4000 was purchased in Philadelphia and sent to the American Minister in London, Rufus King, for transmission to Soho. King was asked not to transfer the bill until he was certain that Boulton had actually shipped the copper blanks.

In March 1801 Boulton was at last able to prepare two separate shipments of planchets, each ten tons in weight. The first of these had been finished in late February while the second was not ready until around March 20. These were dispatched to the Liverpool docks

for loading on a ship bound for Philadelphia but, as luck would have it, they were both loaded on the same vessel, the Swanwick - commanded by R. Kirkbride. There was another delay after this since the ship continued to load cargo for several weeks after the second Boulton shipment of planchets had been brought aboard. Available records do not indicate the date of sailing from Liverpool but it seems to have been in late April or early May.

Captain Kirkbride docked at Philadelphia on July 11 and saw to it that letters entrusted to him were promptly delivered; at that point the director became aware that a shipment of planchets was awaiting him on the Swanwick. Some of the copper planchets had been on board the ship for nearly four and one-half months.

The 1.9 million cent blanks were unloaded from the ship as soon as possible though normally shipments of this type were used as ballast and it would have required several days to unload cargo blocking access to this section of the vessel. Laborers were hired to haul the 430 pound kegs - each containing about 17,500 blanks - from the wharf to the Mint for the sum of nine cents per cask. The exact date of hauling is not known but all 109 casks and one box were safely inside the Mint by July 24, less than two weeks after docking. There was then a delay of several days before cent coinage actually resumed with these fresh blanks. The first coins to leave the Mint did so on August 17, 1801, though coinage certainly began well before that date, perhaps as early as early as Monday, August 10. The reason for the delay in commencing coinage is not known.

It is interesting to note that the July 1801 shipment was not formally brought to the coiner's department until September 18 although a large number of cents - in excess of 200,000 pieces - had already left the Mint. September 18 was thus a bookkeeping fiction but was possibly the date upon which the last of the kegs

was weighed. There were 44,950 pounds 13 ounces entered onto the record, exactly 28 pounds (one 'quarter' in the old reckoning) less than that invoiced by Boulton.

Once coinage did begin, however, it proceeded at a very strong pace throughout the rest of 1801 and well into 1802. This copper coinage was distributed very rapidly to waiting banks and merchants. Under normal conditions, and using the single cent press as always, Mint workmen could produce about 13,000 cents per day, which meant something on the order of about one coin every three seconds. This average includes the occasional down time for changing dies, but it is unlikely that this took more than a few minutes.

When the last delivery of coined cents from the July 1801 planchet shipment was made on February 16, 1802, the Treasurer of the Mint, Benjamin Rush, was able to determine that this delivery by Boulton had contained a considerable number of blanks above that called for by the weight. There ought to have been about 1,872,950 cent planchets but the coiner had delivered 1,910,437 pieces and there were yet on hand about 8,250 misstruck cents. There were thus more than 47,000 excess planchets in the shipment by count as compared to the number called for by weight.

The excess number was credited in the Mint books as an overplusage while a deficient number would have been marked as an underplusage. Overplusages were rather rare, underplusages were not, calling forth frequent remarks to Boulton on being careful about the average weight of ready-made blanks. An overplusage, within limits since the pieces could not be too light, increased Mint profit on copper coinage.

Economy-minded Mint officials did not waste the roughly 8,250 misstruck cents that had accumulated in the nearly seven months of

coining this shipment. In August 1802 the coiner was given these pieces for further use. They were rolled down to the correct thickness and then half cent blanks were punched from the rolled-down cents. The planchets were then fed into the coining press and 8,200 pieces delivered by the coiner to the treasurer for public distribution. The remaining clippings were used by the melter and refiner as alloy for the coinage of the precious metals; it was the end of the July 1801 shipment.

Records kept by the Mint enable us to determine several interesting points about the July 1801 shipment. First of all, since there was an overplusage, the average weight of the cent planchets had to be under the legal 168 grain standard. Calculations show that these weighed an average of just under 164 grains while the misstruck pieces averaged only about 161 grains. It may well be that pieces which were too light tended to jam in the coining press and thereby caused misstriking. The overall misstriking rate was under one-half of one per cent.

In late 1801 the Mint had received a second shipment of planchets from Matthew Boulton and these were laid aside awaiting exhaustion of the July 1801 delivery. On February 20, 1802, the coiner receipted for 56,041 pounds of copper cent planchets, containing 2.3 million pieces. All were coined by October 4, 1802. Elias Boudinot had achieved his aim.

#### APPENDIX

##### I. The Bill of Exchange

On May 9, 1801, James Yard purchased a £4000 bill of exchange from Alexander Baring payable to Sir Francis Baring in London. Yard, acting as agent for the Mint, then sold the bill to the government for \$16,800, equivalent to sterling @  $157\frac{1}{2}$  ( $\pounds 1 = \$4.20$ ). Par was

166 2/3 ( $\pounds 1 = \$4.44 \frac{4}{9}$ ) based on the fictional value of sterling at \$2.66 2/3. The par value of  $\pounds 4000 @ 166 \frac{2}{3}$  was \$17,777.77, giving a paper profit to the Mint of \$977.77.

## II. Cost of Cent Planchets

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sterling</u>	<u>Dollars*</u>	<u>Mills/ Planchet**</u>
Cake (raw) copper @ $\pounds 146/\text{ton}$	$\pounds 2,929.16.00\frac{1}{2}$	\$13,021.45	6.96
Rolling, annealing, milling, and cutting out @ 27/- per cwt	541.16.03 $\frac{1}{2}$	2,408.07	1.29
109 casks and 1 box	14.12.00	64.89	.03
Liverpool duty and customs	84.19.10	377.74	.20
Insurance premium	157.18.04	701.85	.37
Commission and policy	14.03.00	62.89	.03
<u>Subtotal</u> (paid to Boulton)	$\pounds 3,743.06.00$	\$16,636.89	8.88
Shipping - Baker & Comegys		154.92	.08
Misc.***		21.37	.01
<u>Total</u>		\$16,813.18	8.98

\*  $\pounds 1 = \$4.44 \frac{4}{9}$

\*\* Mills/planchet calculated at the theoretical number of blanks (1,872,950). 10 Mills equal one cent.

\*\*\* Customs (37¢), porterage (\$10.00), and postage on letters to Boulton (\$11.00).

Note: adjustments have been made in this table compared to Boulton's original bill of  $\pounds 3,745.09.03$  due to 28 pounds of copper invoiced but not received by the Mint.

## III. Disposition of Cent Planchets

Received from Boulton in July 1801: ca. 1,918,687 blanks.

Used for coinage:

<u>Date of Delivery</u>	<u>Warrent Number</u>	<u>Number of Cents</u>
September 29, 1801	20	505,000
October 21	21	223,000
November 5	22	161,000
December 8	23	301,913
December 30	24	171,924
January 16, 1802	25	209,000
February 16	26	338,600
<u>Total</u>		1,910,437

Half cents made from misstruck cents: August 14, 1802 - 8200 pieces

Clippings to melter and refiner: August 14, 1802

Recapitulation (avoirdupois):

44,760.87 lbs.	1,910,437 cents
98.40 lbs.	8,200 half cents
91.54 lbs.	clippings
44,950.81 lbs.	Total - July 1801 delivery

#### IV. Profit and Loss

Cost of copper: \$16,813.18	Cents: \$19,104.37
	Half cents: 41.00
	Clippings: 34.24
	Total: \$19,179.61

Gross profit: \$2,366.43

Gross profit included the following: wages and salaries  
materials  
dies  
costs of distribution

Sources: (RG 104, National Archives)

Coiner's Copper Account with the Treasurer, 1796-1837

→ Coiner's Copper Book, 1796-1803

Boulton Letters, 1796-1838

Director's Letter Book, 1795-1824

Waste Book, Volume I, 1794-1802

Treasurer's Account Book, 1794-1826

Register of Warrants, 1792-1817

General Correspondence, 1792-1802

Bullion Ledger A, 1794-1802